

**General Plan 2020 Steering Committee Meeting
August 24, 2002 – Minutes**

Attendees:

Mark Price	Alpine
Chuck Davis	Bonsall
Tim McMaster	Crest/ Dehesa
Pat Brown	Julian
Richard Hensle	Lakeside
Dutch van Dierendonck	Ramona
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
John Ferguson	Spring Valley
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle De Oro
John Elliott	Descanso
Jim Yerdon	Valley Center

**Note: A full quorum was not present.*

Public/ Visitors:

Sachiko Kohatsu
Eric Bowlby
Lesley Kinsley
Charlene Ayer
Carol Leone
Hank Palmer
Parke Troutman
Joan Kearney
Richard Smith

Planning Commissioner:

Michael Beck

Staff:

Tom Harron, County Counsel
Ivan Holler
LeAnn Carmichael
Rosemary Rowan
Sandra Gillins
Dixie Switzer
Dahvia Locke-Rubinstein
Galya Button

Steering Committee Minutes - August 24, 2002

Meeting commenced at 9:02.

M. Beck: We are still going through Land Use Framework issues that have been discussed for a while. Rosemary Rowan will establish a framework for the agenda discussion today and then we'll get right into it.

Rowan: The framework for discussion today will start off with essentially finishing up the review of the Non-Residential designations. We have a couple of issues to look at: Specific plan Area and Impact Sensitive, which we did not get to. After that we will go back and review Regional Categories again because changes were made based on our first meeting about Regional Categories and also Residential Designations, although few changes were made in residential designations. So we will start off with Specific plan Area.

M. Beck: Page 15. Does everyone understand what Specific plan Areas are and Specific plans and what the structure of them is?

R. Rowan: The proposed summary description for Specific plan Areas is that the designation would be applied to areas with a vested specific plan as we have today. Staff has been looking at all the community plan areas and looking at Specific plans that are not vested and generally speaking, those are being removed. However, in the future the plan is that we would not have this as a designation. It does not mean we won't have Specific plans. Specific plans will come in as they have development projects as opposed to being included in the community plan for future purposes. Why? There are several reasons and one of the major reasons is definition of Specific plans as defined by state law. Essentially there is supposed to be an implementation method. So, Specific plans come in, and as they are approved they will be added to the community plan maps. We won't call them an SPA, but your maps will identify that there is a specific plan in that area. You will also list name and ordinance for the plan on your community maps. The only difference is that it will not be a designation. Instead they will simply be mapped as what they are. If they are a residential land use, it will show as residential; it's 1DU/2AC or 4.3DU/AC or whatever it is. If it's industrial, it's "Industrial". However how it's mapped is just to provide some visual information as to what is in that SPA. Part of this is just to make sure that graphically one can see what is going on in the SPA. Right now you cannot see this, as it is just a blob and all that is known is that primarily it is residential. So it is not that there will not be an SPA in the future, it's just that they will come in as development proposals as opposed to being designated as a SPA for future use.

M. Beck: Does everyone understand the basics?

R. Hensle: The tool of the SPA will still exist. It just won't be mapped as it is now. It will have some sort of outline around it, I presume? And inside will the industrial and commercial be designated and it will have that hard line around it showing that there are certain restrictions?

R. Rowan: Right. And that's why we will list the name of the SPA and the ordinance number so people will understand that even though you see the map, if you really want to see what is actually going on you have to go back and look at the original ordinance.

J. Phillips: What do you intend to do with the Specific plans in our area?

I. Holler: With the Specific plans that are existing, we will continue to depict them the way that they are today. What Rosemary is talking about is how we would handle future Specific plans that might be proposed. The existing ones, we will continue to depict them as they are today.

J. Phillips: Well then she misquoted because she said that they are going to eliminate, phase out means eventually to eliminate, the land use designation.

M. Beck: The existing SPA's will be grandfathered as they are. They will stay on the books and remain obligated to the same conditions that were placed on them.

J. Phillips: That's not the question. It's a mapping question. The community plan distribution map is what I'm talking about and, specifically, are you going to leave it in Valle De Oro under your plans or identify the SPA's as "1.4" for the area that is covered by Rancho San Diego?

R. Rowan: In general most community planning groups will have a choice about how they want to map their existing SPAs. In many cases they're going to look just exactly the way they do today. However, if whenever possible there is an existing SPA in a community where there is a variety of land uses we would like to map them if possible to see what is going on. Generally the SPA's that are mapped will be the same as today.

J. Phillips: The danger with putting land categories that represent future Specific plans on a general plan map really restricts the ability to change and slightly modify that Specific plan and we found that it's been absolutely essential. Our Specific plans maps are blob maps and they are even blobbier than the rest of the plan maps because usually it is one large ownership, maybe 1000 acres and when you get to normal land use mapping its based on property boundaries, so when you try to apply this to a large single ownership, breaking it down into little blobs the actual boundaries get very confused. It is best to keep a Specific plan as a separate document and map because you don't know what the exact boundaries are before the roads have been planned that will serve these 1000 ac plans. I don't believe that staff can do what is proposed accurately because the roads will end up in different places when the plan is implemented and also the property boundaries end up in different places. I really question the ability of this at the general plan level. I think when you say this 2000 ac is going to have a density of 2DU/AC or 1DU/AC, even trying to put the blobs on that map will cause serious problems later when the detailed development starts to occur and they find environmental problems, and they need to shift these boundaries or these blobs. We've been through this whole thing in the development of the Rancho San Diego area.

I. Holler: Actually, what Jack is describing would probably require a general plan amendment anyway. The specific plan was proposed to change what is on the general plan as its shown today. In other words, staff is not able today to anticipate where a specific plan might be proposed and how that might differ from what is depicted on the general plan. In some cases if the specific plan proposal doesn't change the intensity or the density or the ratio of the mix of uses, we would likely be able to make a conformance finding even if the pieces were in different locations. However, if they were proposing to increase the density or increase the intensity, an applicant proposing a specific plan would have to do a general plan amendment regardless. What we're saying is we're not intending to use these as placeholders and leave big blanks on our general plan map.

J. Phillips: A lot of changes would be pushed to a general plan amendment that would not normally have been, because when you first adopt a specific plan you don't know for sure where things will be and there are no property boundaries since it is generally under one ownership.

L. Carmichael: You're talking about after you have the specific plan approved and then when they do the little tweaks here and there as they come in to develop.

J. Phillips: Right.

L. Carmichael: That's something we've talked about a lot and on the back page staff we're trying to figure out a way and we're also working with Tom to figure it out so you don't need a general plan amendment (GPA) when trying to shift and tweak plans as long as there are no density changes. We don't want to lock them into a GPA to shift a little bit, but we do want the general plan map to show general locations of where those are, but you have to go to the specific plan to get the details.

J. Phillips: The danger is if you allow these shuffles in this area that you have just drawn a line around that says 'by the way this is a specific plan but here is what the land uses are going to be.' If you allow these little shuffles in there, how long it will take before these little shuffles go over the remainder of your land use distribution map? I think it's very dangerous to try to combine these two philosophies.

J. Ferguson: I do not see a problem. It sounds like staff just wants to represent the SPA and that it will not be official for the SPA in the same sense that it's just going to be the best guess. So (J. Phillips) what kind of problems are you seeing that we're not seeing?

J. Phillips: Well, because they're saying the land use designations will be part of the land use distribution map. Right now the land use designation is SPA and overall density. That tells everyone that they have to go to another document to see what condition that SPA is in- another distribution map.

J. Ferguson: So, J. Phillips' problem is with making changes.

M. Beck: First of all, let's separate the existing SPA's from the potential implementation of future SPA's.

J. Ferguson: I'm talking about implementation of future SPA's

J. Phillips: I'm talking about a real SPA where they have Commercial, Industrial, and Residential.

M. Beck: These are blobs that identify land uses. So let's just try to get to the bottom of this and see if there is a problem or if there is not. So, is that a fair depiction of the situation that you're (J. Phillips) describing?

J. Phillips: No, this is absolutely is not a fair description of what they described because they have your single family residential and that is not a land use category. There's a whole bunch of single-family land use categories so you couldn't map it this way.

R. Rowan: You're (J. Phillips) correct and it would have to be mapped with a land use designation and the only reason that staff has to map it as such is that the density for that SPA is for the overall area and not for that particular residential component of that area.

J. Phillips: Well then you're not mapping it with the land use designations.

I. Holler: Correct. In the future it would be. Currently, it won't.

J. Phillips: You will not be able to determine the boundaries of what single-family land use designations go where in that blob, and you're saying you will.

R. Rowan: Actually, if you look at the specific plan it can be determined.

J. Phillips: That is not typical.

I. Holler: But when a SPA is submitted and adopted or approved that specific plan has those particular densities shown on that plan. We would simply be able to transfer those onto a general plan.

R. Rowan: Actually on the back the single-family residential areas are 4.3 du/ac.

J. Phillips: Otay Ranch is a more typical SPA where they have a whole series of residential designations, all different levels of commercial use based on compatibility with the residential.

M. Beck: So Jack your specific issue is with the accuracy of the maps, not the overall density within the SPA, right? Or the general uses?

J. Phillips: That is one concern, the other one is if we use these rough boundaries and allow them to somehow just change these boundaries because a road can't go where they thought it would and a boundary can't be somewhere, and they have to move them, where is the typical action of specific plan and you say 'we're going to allow them wiggle room' then I'm worried about the whole rest of the land use distribution map for our community allowing wiggle room.

M. Beck: Well wiggle room does not allow for change of use or density or density use.

L. Jones: How do you put that in there without creating a loophole?

I. Holler: The general plan still controls that, the specific plan can't override the general plan so the general plan sets the density. The specific plan allows you to move pieces around and do some adjustments and in the case where the specific plan might propose moving some of the pieces, we may be able to make a conformance finding that would not require a general plan amendment. On the other hand, if they're significantly altering the specific plan, we may need to do a general plan amendment as well as a specific plan amendment.

L. Jones: Its difficult to put that in place without the opposite thinking. A simple example would be moving a road. Well the road can't go there so you move the road somewhere else and the density of where you moved it then has to be moved somewhere else so the makeup of the plan as its been approved by the planning group suddenly looks different.

M. Beck: Let's go back to the whole concept of the specific plan. The idea is that within a context that defines appropriate uses and so on, you want to custom plan a large area so that it makes sense. If that's the general philosophy and the reason behind that category in the first place, unless you absolutely define everything day one then it presumes that are going to be some adjustments. But if you control the impacts, the uses and the densities then whatever stage its at as it gets more and more refined, the overall impacts cannot change. The location of uses can change, but that's the whole idea in the first place. If the planning group takes a position at some stage in the game in this process from very general to very specific right before implementation, anything that requires a specific plan amendment or general plan amendment obviously goes back to the planning group and to the public. So that determination about what elevates a change to a level of significance is not something, if you are not comfortable with that possibility, then we can't have SPAs. They are part of that same thought process. If you agree with the logic of having the ability to customize an area within constraints then you have to say that 'we will start with the general and eventually we will get more specific and whenever we have a change that's proposed that is beyond the threshold of significance then it requires a general plan amendment.' Anything that changes the intensity, the density or the overall uses is going to be a general plan amendment.

L. Jones: I think your concern is completely (*inaudible term*) if it has to require a general plan amendment.

M. Beck: Agreed. That is the concern and if there is total unease with having a process that allows insecurity, then an SPA process should not be allowed at all because it is implicit in the process that there are going to be considered changes along the way.

I. Holler: The same thresholds would be used today. We would look to see if changes and proposes in a specific plan would require a general plan amendment. The changes described about moving a road may not require a general plan amendment but may require a specific planning amendment.

M. Beck: That is correct.

J. Ferguson: This will be a summary, not quite official as the previous one?

R. Rowan: That's correct.

J. Phillips: How can you change something on our Land Use Distribution Map, which is half of our community plan, without having a general plan amendment? That's my concern. Once we open the door to allow someone to sit down and change lines on that map, for any reason, without a general plan amendment, then we've opened the door to this happening for all kinds of reasons. That door isn't open now.

M. Beck: Are you talking about the precedent that would be set within the context of Specific plan Areas kind of migrating outside of that context to affect other...?

J. Phillips: Allowing anyone to change our Land Use Distribution Map or not follow it...

M. Beck: Jack, I'm trying to understand. Are you talking about the fact that this process would be allowed within an SPA that might not trigger a general plan amendment, that that precedent would then spread out to other land use?

J. Phillips: It would allow them to build something other than what is shown on the Land Use Distribution Map.

M. Beck: Outside of the SPA as well?

J. Phillips: In the SPA. My concern is that once you allow that in the SPA, whatever process you use to allow that, is going to be a process that will eventually migrate to elsewhere.

M. Beck: Let's stay on that specific point. What is the threshold for a general plan amendment? That is the question, is it not, Jack?

J. Phillips: Yes, if you change something on the map only you don't want to change it on the map because that involves a general plan amendment process so you go ahead and change it through whatever means.

M. Beck: How is what is being proposed now different than what we have with respect to this trigger for a general plan amendment?

T. Harron: It is not different. The test is consistency. We have to make the finding that the approval is consistent with both the general plan and the specific plan. Basically, the fundamental document is the general plan. If we try to make any changes in the specific plan or general proposal that is not consistent with the general plan, it will not be allowed. That is the standard and then the question is, "Does our decision reasonably meet that standard"?

M. Beck: (To J. Phillips) The response is that the threshold that triggers a general plan amendment is not being changed with this proposal.

J. Phillips: I submit that, what I'm hearing described in your process, that it would be, because you would end up with development that does not conform with the community plan map. You would have to change the map to do what you want.

R. Rowan: Actually, it is quite the opposite if it's mapped out on the community plan map. It's more likely that you're going to have to conform to that approved map. Right now it is not even mapped out. A lot of people don't even know what the distribution of land uses is within a SPA.

J. Phillips: I'm assuming those cases are different than what we are talking about.

R. Rowan: I don't think so.

J. Phillips: I'm assuming you have an SPA that has identified with Commercial, Industrial, Residential areas and that's the only thing you can put on a community plan map in the way you're describing. If they have no plan, then obviously you can't put anything in our community plan map.

I. Holler: That is right. If there is no submittal that would require a specific plan we can't leave a void so we would propose...*(inaudible)*.

J. Phillips: Basically, I like what you are proposing except for the implications of change and we have seen literally dozens of changes in our specific plans that would drive a general plan amendment if it were mapped in the way you are talking about.

R. Rowan: I'm really confused Jack. On one hand you say you want to make sure you have flexibility in the SPAs and on the other hand you say you are worried about having flexibility in the SPAs because it might change something that's critical. So I don't understand. We are trying to take a middle ground here.

J. Phillips: I didn't say that. Fully a third of our planning area is a major specific plan and we've been through every agony you can live and are dealing with it.

M. Beck: Let me try to identify the issue. Is the issue the threshold that would trigger a general plan amendment in the end? Is that the bottom line here? And if we take any action that it will affect that threshold in that decision making process?

L. Jones: That is the issue I have.

J. Phillips: Yes. That threshold does not allow the movement of any lines that you have established on our community plan map without a general plan amendment.

L. Carmichael: Let's again separate the existing plans from those proposed in the future. The current plans that would be depicted on the map like we have on that last page, that would be for illustrative purposes only and if those shift ever so slightly that's not going to matter because you have to go to the specific plan map for the details. So the existing ones that are out there today, the difference between a general plan amendment today and tomorrow will not change. The ones in the future though that we do map with an actual land use designation instead of an SPA, you are right, they will need a general plan amendment if they wanted to shift the residential and the commercial or something like that. So it actually gets more rigid in the future with the specific plan than it would with those existing specific plans.

J. Phillips: Yes, and I'm not sure we want to go that way. I've got one more point. There was talk within the last ten minutes about moving the community plan controls over a specific plan to some appendix somewhere. Definitely don't want that to happen. In our community we have used those controls very effectively to keep undesired changes in our specific plan from occurring. So in our specific case, I wouldn't want that to be moved to an appendix. It's hard language in our community plan and once things are in the appendix, they are not hard language.

L. Carmichael: If it is in the community plan it would need a general plan amendment to change it.

R. Rowan: It is just a way of organizing it.

T. Harron: We just want to figure out a place to put it. On the map itself, the general plan map, we want to give people an idea of what the uses are. We also want them to know in certain areas that there is a specific plan and so there is another to look at. So the question is 'where do you make the reference?' and the appendix seemed to work.

J. Phillips: The Valle De Oro Community Plan is hard text. It is not referenced to anything. The Rancho San Diego specific plan's synopsis (?) is about three pages.

T. Harron: That is the problem. When you are talking about the land use map you can't put three pages of text there, but you want to give some indication of what the uses are. So how do we show in the map what kind of uses are there, the characterization, the classification (Residential or Commercial) and then at the same time alert the person that beyond that classification there exists another document that severely restricts the way that property use will go? So we want to reference the specific plan. What we are concerned about is when looking at the map, seeing what classification of uses is permitted where. You can't put three pages of text on that.

J. Phillips: Well, take a look at our text and it will show you how to do it. If you want to describe the specific plan in the community plan text in a summary it needs to be a hard call out for Specific plan Areas. You can list them if you have more than one.

R. Rowan: For existing Specific plans, we're not proposing to take it out of your community plans. We're proposing to leave it but because it is so wordy, put it in the appendix. Whether it's in your land use text or in your appendix, it doesn't change its legal situation at all.

J. Phillips: I'm telling you 'you may not do that.' You will leave it where it is as a hard text where the hard requirements are not in an appendix.

M. Beck: We will address this broader issue of whether it is in the text or appendix or both.

J. Ferguson: While I have been waiting, two more issues have been raised. County Counsel missed the point I think. Also, County Counsel seems to be saying the 'law is this' and 'use is this' and doesn't seem to be concentrating on the legality of these areas.

M. Beck: (To J. Ferguson) This is not as compartmentalized as that. The idea here is that collectively we are going to try to make a system that's not working so well work better and the expertise that's in the room is intended to come to an agreement about how to do that. So, this table here is set up to work through those issues and whoever has expertise about anything or rational opinion is welcome....[Please make your point].

J. Ferguson: One point is a summary, which is what is in here, would not carry the same stuff and the appendix part doesn't matter, but the summary part would lose general plan status. That's something I'm willing to accept but it is a point. Also, it doesn't matter if we are talking about future or past specific plan areas. The key issue is if the map is part of the general plan or not. If it's part of the general plan then things would have to change it, if its not part of the general plan then it doesn't. Jack is saying we're crossing the lines and that's dangerous because now you can put something on the map without an amendment.

M. Beck: Is that a question about whether or not a change in the map requires a change in the general plan?

J. Ferguson: Yes.

I. Holler: Yes. The map is a component of the general plan and it would require a general plan amendment. Tom, if the description of a specific plan is summarized and placed in a community plan appendix as opposed to the body of a community plan, legally does it have same weight as in the appendix?

J. Phillips: This is wrong. Only if it has reference in body of the text that says 'this specific plan shall be in accordance with appendix 3' will it have any effect.

M. Beck: We will ensure that that will be there. Your concern is that in shifting or restructuring this document and the associated supporting documents that somehow some threshold is passed that doesn't allow for consistency finding in the general plan. We will ensure that that will not happen. So when we get a specific example of this maybe we can get some specific language written somewhere that will satisfy that. But to have an impasse here- that's not leaving us anywhere and is not a productive use of our time.

J. Ferguson: "Summary," to me, means you remove all the specifics. I'm not worried about that but I think it will happen. The response to the question on the map was that presently any changes require a general plan amendment but what you are proposing is moving the SPA without it. So that threshold of general plan amendment.....(*inaudible*).

M. Beck: What I suggest on this issue is that if the question is that 'in this transition from the old world to this new world that we're creating the threshold for triggering general plan amendment will change, we want to know how and why and to what degree. And if it will not change we want to know why.' Is that posing the question here?

J. Ferguson: I thought we were talking to map or to not map.

M. Beck: The whole point of having a map of a land uses is that you want to retain that if you decide that's what you want and any change to that will trigger a general plan amendment which puts you back in the game.

Jim Yerdon: Now I am more confused. What I'm hearing is that its either vested or proposed. Is still in the pipelines vested but not yet built and we are concerned about other changes that may come about and 'is that threshold changing'?

R. Rowan: That seems to be the point in the process. We are describing a long-range specific plan You will build it in phases and can change it as those phases come up.

Jim Yerdon: It really only pertains to those specific plans, as we make this transition, that are vested but not fully built out which has got to be a limited number of SPAs countywide. In trying to figure that out on pg 15 in the middle "summary description of specific plans or copy of existing community plan text". Why not put both requirements of specific plan in the appendix as part of the community plan? Therefore it is still in the appendix so it is not bulking up the community plan but since it is in the appendix it is part of the community plan and is locked in. That should satisfy all parties.

R. Rowan: The text for the plan was created in advance for an SPA and so there is a lot of text in community plans that address how a specific plan should be developed in the future. However, the actual requirements for that SPA in most cases are in the ordinance for that specific plan that gets approved. In some cases of course, if that description is already in the community plan then that ordinance needs to be consistent. What we are saying is that that advanced text wouldn't be in a community plan. Instead, there will be a summary description of the ordinance that gets approved into your appendix so you have a good idea of what's supposed to happen in that plan. But the meat, the description, is really in your ordinance. We still want to maintain some general plan level of information on the SPA in the community plan without bulking it up, without trying to reproduce the ordinance itself, without trying to create a problem in whether or not it is being changed. However we recognize the link between the community plan text and specific planning areas out there and we respect that. If it needs to be reproduced and kept in the community plan that is fine, but in the future we'd like to simplify that system.

Gil Jemmott: This covered my issue well.

L. Jones: I want to clarify that changes in the map are for existing SPAs.

R. Rowan: It is actually more likely for existing SPAs because many of them can't be mapped out.

L. Jones: how can you do that until we do study of the specific plans... (inaudible)?

R. Rowan: Mapping will occur after the specific plan amendment.

L. Jones: For the general plan map now, it will just be an SPA.

R. Rowan: Exactly.

(L. Jones: Inaudible comment.)

R. Rowan: In the past they did that. This proposal is that we're not going to do that to change the SPAs. If it is already vested that's different.

L. Jones: But in the community plan you want to know what it will look like in the future which is why you put it in the specific plan.

R. Rowan: Correct. We need to establish the general policies in the community plan to address general areas in the community.

L. Jones: General areas, densities, etc.?

R. Rowan: Land uses and important things that need to be addressed. There are all kinds of issues that need to be addressed in the community plan as policies but that's different than applying a whole page or two pages worth of very specific development-oriented (information) to a specific outline area called an SPA which may be owned by one landowner or more than one land owner that hasn't even been brought in at the specific plan.

L. Jones: As long as you can protect the densities and the overall uses.

R. Rowan: Absolutely.

J. Phillips: I have been trying to listen closely and I'm sensing what I think is the problem that I'm having with staff on this. I keep hearing this referred to as putting information into the community plan to inform people. That's not what the community plan is used for once it is published. It is a regulatory document of the very highest order and planning groups end up using it and the language in it as the rules that have to be followed and if its just put in there for information, you don't get the right context. I'm very concerned that staff is sending these out as information documents and at least I'm thinking of these as means we have in the future of actually having an effect on the growth in our area.

M. Beck: I think its possible to resolve this issue because I don't think that's what staff is proposing. I'm hearing that any changes require a general plan amendment. This was a proposal to restructure how that information in the community plan is formatted. I don't know if it's necessary that every community plan have the same format. But, what I'm hearing staff say, (and this is why I'm suggesting we reduce these things to a white paper to explain it so that it is on record), is that the threshold for general plan amendments are not changing in this proposal. Jack, do you feel that the threshold will change?

J. Phillips: Not if we watch it very closely and what actually comes out. I have that fear because I'm hearing our general plan text turn into an information document rather than a development control document. I'm worried about that and maybe its just individual staff people who see it that way.

M. Beck: I think we've heard both things and I think a community plan, as you even suggested yourself, functions in different ways. It is obviously a regulatory document but it is also an informational document.

J. Ferguson: It does seem that the poor copy of existing community plan text is sort of grandfathered to keep existing SPAs in and put new ones elsewhere but Gary was really saying something different for a long time now so I suggest we wait for Gary.

M. Beck: We've already invested a lot of time in this. I think this is a very important, productive conversation. So, Leann will give it a try to explain and we will give it a little bit and move on.

D. VanDierendock: I've read this thing for about four days and sat here listening to this very intently. When I read the community plan text on page 15, it says to locate a summary description of the specific plan. 'Summary,' you want more so you dig in. What they say is 'we have a summary description but that is not a bottom line issue, that is just the beginning.' It means people need to look further for more information, they need to reference a greater source of information. That does not violate community plans at all. Any changes that have to be made on that have to come before a general plan amendment. That's simple to me.

L. Carmichael: If you have a minor change to the line that doesn't result in acreage changes or density changes, then they need a specific plan amendment but they wouldn't need a general plan amendment. But in the future, if we map these with actual land use designations and we map the actual density, if they need to do a change that does not result in density or acreage change, if they change that line a few feet then they will not just need a specific plan amendment. They will also need a general plan amendment. (L. Carmichael created and explained a graphic example of this.)

R. Rowan: We can begin to define what that threshold is and that's something staff should address. Obviously you don't want a situation where it takes a lot to make minor changes that doesn't make any difference in the plan at all. On the other hand, you don't want landowners coming in and moving lines that actually have significant changes and impacts on the community. Staff needs to spend some time to figure out how to better those thresholds in writing.

T. Harron: The procedure for a specific plan amendment is exactly the same as for a general plan amendment. The only difference between the two is the limit in number of general plan amendments you can do a year: four. Typically they schedule those so that you have every four months something on the agenda. But, when you talk about magnitude of these actions, waiting three months doesn't mean much. A specific plan amendment takes three months anyways. So, that difference is really not that significant.

M. Beck: There are a couple of issues that need to be refined on paper. One of the issues has to do with this threshold for general plan amendments. The other has to do with any proposed changes in the community plan text, which may trigger this threshold or somehow reduce the regulatory authority or muscle of the community Plan. We will get both of these issues down to their essence, distilled to what is germane on them and have them written up. We will get that to you as soon as possible. Does that sound like an okay place to leave this and so we can move on?

J. Phillips: One exception. The plan that is on page 15 is not okay. I want you to understand that.

M. Beck: What is not okay?

J. Phillips: It is talking about plans for the future of existing SPAs and treatment of existing SPAs that are not okay.

M. Beck: The proposal is not okay or the specific plan is not okay?

J. Phillips: The proposal. We've been talking about it for an hour and I want staff to understand that this approach is not okay and they know what we want and we told them 15 to 20 times. So please be advised that we don't want our major specific plan mapped in this manner.

Rowan: If it is an existing specific planning area and you don't want it mapped any different than you have it today, there is nothing in this text that says you have to do that.

J. Phillips: One of the biggest weaknesses in doing this in this manner is the County hasn't put forth yet an Open Space land use designation.

M. Beck: We are about to do that. Public Facility Open Space, Page 14, is next.

R. Rowan: The summary of the proposal is simple. Based on the conversation we had in our last meeting, staff made some minor changes. We are still proposing that we distinguish between facilities and we are calling those public or quasi-public facilities but we are describing those essentially that the critical aspect is designed for public use. Whether it is a private hospital or not is not the point- it is for public use. A hospital is generally a public facility in the sense that it's for public use. We are also distinguishing between a facility and open space and we are suggesting that we get rid of the reference to Public and Quasi-Public open space and simply have an Open Space designation that does not say who owns it. It is just Open Space. The proposed definition for that is that "it is land or water that is devoted to an open space use. The uses would include but are not limited to the preservation of natural resources, outdoor recreation, and areas left over for protection of public health and safety." We also included on page 14 a proposed conversion policy that would need to be refined but it really addresses conversion of a lot of different kinds of uses that include public facilities, open space, military installations, tribal lands, and even state parks or national forest. A change from any of those designations would require a general plan amendment so any change or conversion would have to go through a GPA process which would go back to the community in terms of taking a look at what that change would be for that proposed land. That is the proposal.

D. van Dierendonck: I can understand that military bases and Indian reservations would be considered "Open Space" even though they are not definitely public space.

R. Rowan: Actually, tribal lands would have a separate designation.

Dutch : That works because we have absolutely no control over that at all. And the military reservations come down to it, other than Environmental Protection Agency, we have zero control over them. So, removing them to me makes sense and the conversion of other land designated as quasi-public requiring a general plan amendment strikes me as being okay. I can agree with the proposed summary description on that.

T. Harron: You mentioned in the definition "for protection of public health and safety. I recommend "public health safety and general welfare" instead of "public health and safety."

M. Price: Does this deal at all with land that would become tribal land?

M. Beck: Maybe it is worth somebody on staff explaining what is tribal land within their sovereign authority and when they purchase land that is not within the reservation, what category that it is in and also annexing that into the tribal context.

I. Holler: If a tribe wants to acquire land, simply purchasing it doesn't change the designation on that land where that land would be part of an independent sovereign nation. That would require an action from the Bureau of Indian affairs to change that. Once the BIA acts, we don't have jurisdiction over those lands. Until that point we do.

M. Price: Is there nothing we can put in place to trigger a general plan amendment to say they can't take that new land out of the tax rolls. This is a major issue for us in Alpine because what the County is proposing with FCI 40 acre minimum and zoning for generations to come that is making that land very affordable to the tribes. So tribes are picking it up at pennies on the dollar from people who have worked their entire life to acquire this land and you're saying there's absolutely nothing we can do to prevent them from pulling that property into their tribal land and taking it off the tax roll.

M. Beck: Property owners do not have to sell that property to the tribes. And it is not a given that the Bureau of Indian affairs will actually allow that annexation to occur. So this process is a legitimate process that establishes land use and a rationale for that land use and those decisions can ultimately be used to argue against the Bureau of Indian Affairs allowing the transfer.

M. Price: My underlying point is, is there anyway we can, as a County, insert ourselves into that process?

M. Beck: We cannot interface between a property owner and the sale of property to tribes.

T. McMaster: Can we go before the Bureau of Indian Affairs?

M. Price: This is a major change in property. I am just wondering is there a way we can make the tribes perform at a higher level?

T. Harron: They have to do an environmental review as well so when they change from low intensity use to high intensity use they have to consider that and that's where we criticize and impose any findings.

P. Brown: I have two questions. First, do state parks have to go through a general plan amendment?

R. Rowan: If they were going to sell their land to private owners and thereby change the designation because the designation is state parks and national forest.

P. Brown: If they want to buy land and convert it into Open Space?

(Staff): No.

P. Brown: In the Public Quasi/Semi-Public we have large holdings of properties that are Semi-Public properties that obviously have a major effect on our area and there is no way of designating these.

T. Harron: You can designate private property Open Space but we do have some uses, recreational uses, which could be a reasonable use of property (*unclear*). The danger comes if the use is so uneconomically feasible that they would then say "lets take the open property" but before they can do that they have to apply for a general plan amendment. So, if we see a use that exists in private hands but it is an Open Space use, we can recognize that in a plan and designate it Open Space.

R. Rowan: On the other hand, a lot of those uses are addressed through the permitting process, whether or not someone needs a minor or major use permit within certain designations in order to have a special use like a camp.

P. Brown: But in our general plan those areas need to be shown on the general plan map as they are now.

M. Beck: So the issue is existing use and underlying zoning.

P. Brown: Yes, it needs to be kept. They are Semi-Public uses only. Not residential.

M. Beck: So maybe the question is this definition of "Semi-Public".

R. Rowan: But Open Space does not address who owns it.

M. Beck: So we are just talking about the designation on community plan maps and my understanding is that this issue is all about those like the ones represented in the Julian community plan.

R. Rowan: I think what he is saying is, "Would the natural designation be Open Space or would it be a Residential designation?". And that seems to be more of a community plan decision.

P. Brown: The answer we got is "neither" so far and we need some kind of system.

R. Rowan: As long as the existing use is consistent with the Open Space designation, which is primarily for recreational use and lots of Open Space, I see no reason why it wouldn't be.

M. Beck: What would you like to see?

P. Brown: I originally ask that they be proposed as Semi-Public.

I. Holler: It looks like we have a couple of options here. Today my understanding is that those are designated as Residential. We can continue to do that, we could add text to the description of Open Space to include that, or potentially we might include them under a Quasi-Public facility.

M. Beck: I think that in reality it is how those lands are used. It sounds like an issue that should be discussed at the planning group level and if you then vote on that and they say that's the right designation, then that would be the specific proposal to the staff.

P. Brown: We'll take that approach and come back.

J. Ferguson: We got added to the Public/Quasi-Public facilities. Can we get something similar or appropriate for things coming out of the Open Space designation. A private park, for example, things that come out of Open Space?

Ivan: I'm not sure that you would want to necessarily look at adjacent uses and say that 'we're now going to say that those lot sizes are appropriate.' The process is that when it comes out of Open Space it goes through a GPA.

C. Davis: We've got a lot of private open space in Bonsall. A guy has 40 acres, he puts a house on it. Environmental people say he can't use 25 acres because it's environmentally sensitive. Is that under this?

M. Beck: No, those are open space easements.

J. Phillips: Does Public/Quasi-Public apply to golf courses?

I. Holler: We are proposing that golf courses would be Open Space as part of outdoor recreation.

L. Jones: It's used as Open Space in mitigating throughout development.

J. Phillips: A lot of golf courses weren't established unfortunately as a balance to Residential density so I'm really conflicted on which way this should go. Some of them are established as a balance to residential density and possibly those could be Open Space. But my question is about Quasi-Public. It (Quasi-Public) says in my mind that a golf course serving the public could be considered a Public/Quasi-Public facility. I'm not encouraging and saying that's how we should do it, but this is what I understand.

R. Rowan: The way it is written, not necessarily. The facility would need a lot of activity such as a hospital, school, etc. But, a golf course would naturally come under the Open Space designation.

J. Phillips: I'll accept that. Does Public/Quasi-Public include churches?

R. Rowan: Typically, a church is going to be part of a residential neighborhood. It would be probably in your zoning ordinance but you wouldn't have a parcel described as quasi-public facility. We're really talking more of a scale issue.

J. Phillips: But a church can include k-12 and even a college level institution.

I. Holler: Then that goes beyond church to private school facility. They are proposing that as an adjunct to the church.

J. Phillips: Would you add to your Open Space designation? You've got some good things here- but you have "for the protection of public health and safety...".

I. Holler: Counsel recommended to add "general welfare."

J. Phillips: There's another reason for "Open Space." You can have large tracts of Open Space in a specific plan that are for balance. I think you need to say "for balance of clustered development" as one of the reasons that this would be used.

T. Harron: The answer to that is "general welfare." You want that land committed. You give it deep restrictions so it won't be developed later.

J. Phillips: The problem is later on their lawyers will come back when the big homeowners associations want to sell their land for money. Their lawyers will say that the land doesn't have important natural resources. Then where do you go?

T. Harron: You don't need that for general welfare. It's just for the benefit of that community, for the quality of life. General welfare is one of the broadest categories and its constantly being reinterpreted and broadened.

M. Beck: It's a GPA. And back to when we agreed that there will be a definition of terms- maybe we can clarify the scope and breadth of the term.

J. Phillips: So you're saying for the "protection of health, safety, and general welfare."

Dutch: The only point I have is with the golf course as Open Space. After sitting through a couple of orientations with Joe De Stefano and CEQA, golf courses are not considered Open Space.

M. Beck: It's one of my issues as well and there is a discussion that needs to take place because the Open Space designation will refer to underlying densities or other potential uses. There is also the issue of "Is a golf course an impact area or commercial use?".

J. Phillips: Is there an intention to use OS number 22 for golf courses?

M. Beck: Yes.

J. Phillips: Then we have a problem with that.

E. Bowlby: Is there a standard for Open Space recreation that is available to the public that doesn't require a fee? Is there a threshold for meeting that standard or will a cost for the citizens to access recreational Open Space perhaps limit the amount of recreational Open Space available?

R. Rowan: It's just a land use designation in the general plan. It wouldn't get to the level of defining things in terms of public, private, etc... It's how the land is used.

E. Bowlby: I guess to be clear I'm looking for answer in terms of is there a standard in terms of availability for OS recreational areas that are not reduced in size by general Quasi-Public facilities?

M. Beck: Is your question related to park standards and that sort of thing?

E. Bowlby: Yes.

T. Harron: If you're not going to let them substitute for designations. What we're doing is saying is that if you want to change that then you have to go through a general plan amendment because we designate that Open Space.

M. Beck: Open Space has zero density. Right now there are golf courses out there with underlying residential zoning. This proposal is that within this category those golf courses will have a zero density.

E. Bowlby: Tom (Harron) said it's a fact that it won't apply to a standard of recreational Open Space. I'm comfortable with that.

J. Phillips: We can't universally apply this Open Space designation to all golf courses. That is problematic. We will bring out forces against what we are doing that have historically owned golf courses and whether or not they can use or can't use, they enjoy an underlying a density of sometimes 1du/4ac, or for example, Steele canyon where it would be 1d./10ac. To all of a sudden change this to zero land use rights such as Open Space, is going to create a firestorm unnecessarily for these golf course owners who are not the poorest people in San Diego County. They will be extremely unhappy and it will create an unnecessary problem for all of us in the communities to do this downzone unnecessarily. Of course, if you have a golf course in a more urban setting and you really want it as part of the Open Space of the community then you can go out there and take that advantage, but our golf courses have either underlying agricultural uses and density and general plan designations or underlying Impact Sensitive and to change this to Open Space with a definition that eliminates development will create an unneeded problem. And I'm saying please don't do it in our area because you want to do it everywhere else. We have unique circumstances. We have recently developed golf courses and we have ancient golf courses and they both will be unhappy when you change their land use designation.

L. Jones: How are private golf courses considered?

I. Holler: Right now we are talking about proposing that golf courses would be designated as open SPace.

L. Jones: I understand that, but if private golf courses are not considered Semi-Public, would this then draw into your trying to take out the Public and Semi-Public designation. If private golf courses are not considered Semi-Public, would this new designation include those private golf courses?

I. Holler: It certainly could.

L. Jones: But it did not before if they were not considered Semi-Public. So now you have private courses that are going into this designation. Where were they before?

T. Harron: They typically had residential and agricultural underlying zones.

L. Jones: For existing private golf courses that underlying zoning is being taken away. Existing courses that have that former underlying zoning or some in cases are in negotiation of development of land where they know that while they are in the planning stages and that have an underlying density use, that goes away with the general plan.

I. Holler: Fortunately, all golf courses weren't created in the same fashion and in some cases, golf courses, and especially the more recent private courses, are probably described as Open Space now as a part of the specific development proposal. What Jack was making reference to is the golf course in his community that was not developed as part of a development proposal but had an Impact Sensitive designation on it because it is in the floodplain. So that's a different case than most of what you're going to encounter in your communities.

L. Jones: Some of the areas in our community have not concurred with those developments but they got some density uses and they may opt to go with all sorts of (Residential uses).

R. Rowan: One of the issues regarding the mapping of golf courses as Open Space is that it's a Commercial use applied to that area and it will have traffic and different types of impacts. If we apply Residential designations to all golf courses in the county, it would change our traffic modeling, our population modeling. It's not reality. It's not how they're actually being used. If you want to convert an existing golf course to residential land use, that's a lot of land and if you were in fact to change that to a residential development would have different impacts than a golf course. True, it depends on density. 1/40 isn't as problematic as 1/4.

M. Beck: Yes, when a golf course is seven hundred acres and it's right in the middle of some place, that's something to consider.

L. Jones: I don't know where to go from there.

H. Palmer: In reference to numerous golf courses within the County, because we can't review the data going around and the impact its having on that, flood planning might be a good use. But I think that we need to look at the impacts and the change. As we said there are many impacts and many of the existing golf courses are built around a residential development and it seems to me that they won't fit into an Open Space designation. I'm suggesting that you might want to summarize the existing uses in a more exhaustive analysis of existing uses.

J. Yerdon: If I understand this correctly, those golf courses that have underlying residential designations and are operating under major use permit, they get put into this, and the major use permit just goes away.

M. Beck: No. The major use permit is associated with the existing use. The MUP is for the golf course.

J. Yerdon: Sounds like you are potentially opening a real can of worms.

M. Beck: An MUP is a tool that you use when you can't pre-identify all sorts of custom uses, golf courses, churches and so it is associated with the use, when somebody proposes it and its get sort of dialed-in for that particular location.

J. Yerdon: But the designations lying underneath the use can change.

M. Beck: The underlying zoning has nothing to do with this particular use.

J. Yerdon: But the current use due to an MUP is what is resulting in being locked in as a new definition.

I. Holler: The use permit might control things like hours of operation, lighting, but the Open Space designation would be separate from controls found in the use permit in terms of the operational issues that are there.

J. Yerdon: My point is the fact that it's currently in operation as a golf course on residential land because of a major use permit and now the county comes in and swaps out the zoning underneath. Are all golf courses regardless of ownership and formation going to be put into Open Space?

M. Beck: That's the proposal.

J. Yerdon: So you're going to open a firestorm. If you create a new term called "Open Space" and we have thousands of Open Space easements on private parcels, can you create a different term?

M. Beck: We'll get into this clarification of Open Space easements and dedicated Open Space. Is that the issue you are proposing?

J. Yerdon: Yes. Just the term. It will create a lot of confusion.

J. Ferguson: Are we suddenly going to find Open Space as a land use category with all sorts of plans, slopes, etc?

R. Rowan: No, but its true that the density in those areas would be determined by some of conditions you mentioned.

M. Price: I just want to voice my objection to putting all golf courses under the Open Space banner.

Public (R. Smith): If I heard all golf courses under Open Space I have to object also. In Lakeside golf courses are different. One is SPA mitigation. The other one is Impact Sensitive area. To make it open SPace, whatever use proposed for future might not be. It was supposed to be temporary. So I think when you look at these, you have to look at how these various golf courses were created, what the circumstances were, and whether they are temporary or permanent.

(Inaudible comment regarding Open Space zoning.)

M. Beck: The zone is as Open Space zone and density is zero.
The proposal is to revisit all the allowed uses in the Open Space designation.

J. Phillips: If we're not going to do it at the same time, then I'm concerned that somehow making all these golf course lands that are integrated into our community in these categories is going to be more harmful than the existing very low-intensive residential designations.

I. Holler: I think that there have been a couple of good points made here. Going back to Rick's example. Rick, in the first example that you offered of the two golf courses where you said one was mitigation for development, there the Open Space designation would be very appropriate because that's exactly what it is. In the other one, however, Open Space may not be and I think what we're going to need to do is come up with the criteria for when we're going to apply an Open Space designation versus a low density designation. In some cases, Open Space on golf courses is extremely important.

Public (R. Smith): The point I was going to make was that an Open Space designation could possibly be golf courses but not all golf courses could be Open Space.

10:55 break.

11:10 resume.

M. Beck: I'm proposing a change in the agenda. The thing that we were going to look at next is "Impact Sensitive". Impact Sensitive is very much related to this last discussion that we just had about the Open Space and the relationship can be described in the example that Jack used because they've got a golf course with underlying Impact Sensitive (4,8, and 20 acre zoning) and that Impact Sensitive category is proposed to be eliminated. What I'm suggesting what we do with that particular issue is bring that up when we bring it up when Open Space is brought up again because they are directly linked. Also, we definitely and very importantly need to talk about the Village and Village lines context. I'd like to get that today. Before we do that, Jack wanted to know, if this question can be answered quickly and easily, the difference, any changes, between the staff report we have now and the last handout that the group was given. (*following brief dialogue*) What I think we'll do is make a copy of this version (R. Rowan's) and send out to the chairs and you'll have that so we can study it. Now, we're going back to Regional categories, Village Limit Line, page 4.

R. Rowan: We did a substantial rewrite based on our first conversation. It was clear that people needed to have more specific writing on what the Village Limit Line is. So, I'll just read it and emphasize pieces we tried to change. "The Village Limit Line is a community specific growth boundary, not a regional growth boundary, that replaces the existing regional growth boundary known as the urban limit line." We also said in a foot note that "Village Limit Lines will be developed by DPLU staff in conjunction with Community Planning and Sponsor Groups". Some of the communities who wish to locate their Village Limit Line along the existing urban limit line can do so. And that is just a detail about what its purpose is. It's community specific but we do recognize that there are some regulatory policies in some communities that they developed along the Urban Limit Line so if they want to put it there, that is fine. The Village Limit Line surrounds lands that are categorized as Village or Village Core so residential densities within the line could range from 2du/ac up to 29du/ac. "The land within the Village Limit Line should have access to existing or planned sewer services." We understand there are holes within this Village Limit Line where people have not attached themselves to sewer services but they should have access to water and sewer services. If you put the Village Limit Line outside an area that is not currently serviced you're saying that service should occur within the next twenty years. Community Planning Areas that contain only Semi-Rural or Rural lands will not have a Village Limit Line and the extension of that is in communities where, such as Twin Oaks, that don't have Village densities. I understand that some people wanted to use this as a method of telling incorporated areas "don't step on my territory" but we're simply suggesting that they need to use other ways to do that. The Village Limit Line is a County method for determining growth that is not meant to be an annexation policy. That is to say that you can't have words in the community plan that address that issue but you need to use your community plan policies to do it. The Village Limit Line is not the appropriate tool for doing that. So if you don't have a Village or Village Core densities you won't really have a Village Limit Line. "Isolated pockets of existing residential developments that contain Village or Village core densities or isolated areas where sewer service, should not be

included in your Village Limit Line.” The reason we say that is to avoid leapfrog growth. You don’t want to stretch your Village Limit Line out to reach a pocket of development thereby inducing growth in the interim area. We’ve addressed some special circumstances over in the right hand side of this description that said within your Village Limit Line you can include pockets of Semi-Rural or Rural land for a variety of reasons. Just because those densities are inside the Village Limit Line doesn’t mean they will have a Village density. They will be what they are designated to be. The purpose of putting this exception in there is that you don’t want to have a Village Limit Line on a community that is so complicated that it gets a little ridiculous. We really want it to be simple and straightforward. But we do recognize that there will be exceptions within there and we’re trying to work with those. It does say here “unless otherwise noted in your community plan, those areas are not subject to a change in designation solely because they’re located in the Village Limit Line.”

M. Beck: This is the issue of the service boundaries. It is a few issues collectively put together. If you have that type of community, it’s what you envision as your community core. It’s a municipal service boundary as well and what’s on the other side of it.

G. Jemmott: How do we indicate to municipal service providers that we are not looking for sewer service in the current unincorporated areas, if that’s the intent of the Village Limit Line? If we can’t have a Village Limit Line because we don’t have a core then we need a decent way of communicating to municipal service providers that we don’t want a sewer in that area. The other thing is that the Village Limit Line is being used to prevent leapfrog development and putting Village and Village core densities outside of the Village core area. If we don’t have a line, how do we say that is not okay? If that is the purpose of that line and we don’t have access to it?

I. Holler: If the very densities that are shown on your plan are not high enough to require sewer service. So, essentially if a special district wanted to provide sewer services to an area with low density in your plan, what has to occur is the line then needs to be sized for the density that’s shown on your plan. The line is not sized so as to allow an increase in density. Then you’d have to come back and evaluate that for the growth producing impacts of the line. So we’re able to say, “fine you can provide sewer service here but you need to size the line to the densities that are shown on the plan.”

M. Beck: Maybe there is a place in the community plan and therefore in the general plan that would allow a Planning Group like Twin Oaks to explain the rationale for the particular zoning that you are choosing. In other words, it is your expectation that this zoning will not necessitate sewer, or something like that that could include the rationale for your zoning and address this concern.

G. Jemmott: If the line is only meant to show division between higher and lower density, it seems like it doesn’t have much utility. Unless, I guess it is to include areas of current lower density within the Village Limit Line.

I. Holler: Actually it does. Using Valley Center as an example, which doesn’t have sewer, if sewer were to be run to Valley Center, where would we want it to be run? Would we want it to be run all over the valley like the municipal water supply is? No. What we are really trying to do in Valley Center is to direct growth and development to nodes where the higher density would be. That’s where we want the sewer to be located that would describe the municipal service boundary. In cases like that it has great value, whereas in cases like Twin Oaks it might have less. The very absence of those densities or line has meaning.

M. Beck: I think you know I support your issues there with regard to that annexation. I think there are other ways that the rationale for your zoning can be captured in the text and be a useful tool for explaining to the service providers that this is the intent and this is the general plan of the County.

D. VanDierendock: In the last 18 months we've had at least two occasions where the Ramona Municipal Water District attempted to run an additional length to their sewer line utilizing the County airport's upgrade of Ramona to piggyback onto a line that they were going to have to put in. And we sat down in a meeting and whenever they said "you can't do this unless we hook up to that," it was within the power of the Planning Group to say "no you're not going to hook up that line because that line is on County property but you are not extending that sewer line because that's growth-inducing." And we asked why they wanted it and they said "to provide service for the future development north of the airport" and we said "no that's not going to happen, it's an SPA." Gary provided us with the info on the Village Limit Line. So it's a workable tool and the facilities are there to use it.

G. Jemmott: Well I believe I'm aware and don't get to use it.

J. Yerdon: I'm curious on how staff defines "isolated pockets". In the Lawrence Welk mobile home park, is there a criteria for an isolated pocket?

I. Holler: I can think of a few examples that have caused particular problems. One occurs in Bonsall on the golf course, Vista Valley. Vista valley is a sewer project with nothing else around that is sewer and sewer lines run quite a way to service that area. That's an issue that we need to deal with and one of the ways that we've discussed in handling a situation is to not draw a Village Limit Line around Vista Valley, but the sewer needs to match the land use. The land use doesn't match the sewer and thus drive densities up. I didn't get the Lawrence Welk issue. That's something we still need to work through.

R. Rowan: It could be that in this case we need to also define criteria for isolated pockets.

J. Yerdon: In this particular case, I see the value of the Village Limit Line because without that people will cut through sewer just for four acres. As far as Escondido is concerned, its virgin territory to be conquered, and they're trying to annex industrial just south of there. If we draw a Village Limit Line it would keep them back.

M. Beck: That's the same issues as Gill's (G. Hemmot). Maybe at some point we need to give specific clout to the policies that would help facilitate those fights. My question has to do with planned sewer services. What's the County going to do with the existing conflict of service providers map and the final map? Any action to explain to sewer districts to change maps?

I. Holler: I'm not sure we need to. If a sewer district wants to show something on their map, they can but we won't approve development at a higher density shown on our map.

M. Beck: It would make sense to make this clear to special districts, water and sewer, that when these plans are completed, that they get a copy and areas that are highlighted and where specific requests are made, that they delete those lines on their maps to conform with County. They can choose not to so in future if there's a showdown the County can be on record as saying that they made them aware.

D. VanDierendock: Can we make a motion of that?

P. Brown: I hope its appropriate that LAFCO be brought into this so that water and sewer districts can accomplish this because it can be cumbersome in some cases.

(unknown): Does the county or can the County and planning groups have an impact on where the independent districts, I'm not too concerned about dependent, do they have power to stop or prevent out of district contracts or annexations we don't want?

T. Harron: It's not a real straight line veto right. Whats going on right now, LAFCO this past year has the authority to audit districts. What would happen is that we set the land use and they put in

the facilities, oversized and wasting public money to put expensive facilities. LAFCO will audit and find that its not a good expenditure of money. What's the consequence? County takes over, annexes as county service. That's a sword that hangs over independent service. Its not a unilateral authority but it's a reorganization of government involving Lafco. With dependent districts we have the ability to keep sewers from being expanded. But with independent districts, the option is to oppose annexation.

I. Holler: The key is to hope to work with districts so facilities align with distributions we propose.

J. Phillips: I have a request. We established our Urban Limit Line based on the regional land use element that we're using and in that Regional Land Use element you'll find existing designation 1, under urban residential. So if you look at our community plan map, our urban limit line which is very important in its relationship to mitigating growth inducement effects of Otay's expansion as an official mitigation in an EIR, is based on these lower residential densities. So when you look at our plan and you say you want to change the Urban Limit Line to the Village Limit Line, then you have a huge conflict. A good portion of our plan is in the current Urban Limit Line which has significant meaning. What I propose is under where you list "pockets...features". I propose you take the "and" out of "natural features" put a comma, and say "and establish development patterns." That would protect those areas. The reasons for disclaimer aren't adequate for lands we are trying to protect.

M. Beck: The term "pattern" might be too general. Staff wants specific language.

R. Rowan: There is the circumstance in Lakeside where they have 1du/ac inside the Urban Limit Line and they don't want it there. They want to change the Urban Limit Line.

J. Phillips: Changing that line may actually legally void that protection.

M. Beck: We'll get there, not take illegal action.

I. Holler: We'd like to work with you (J. Phillips) on the language.

M. Price: I want to echo Jim of Valley Center's concern for the need of a definition for isolated areas.

I. Holler: We'll work on it.

M. Beck: Anything else on this item? (No Comment.) With the exception of defining language, does group want to take action on it?

J. Phillips: How can we act on it if the language is rejected?

M. Price: I move that action is not taken until we see the language in writing.

I. Holler: Leave that motion. No second.

M. Beck: Were there minutes? Minutes will roll over. Staff does not want to establish next meeting date because of a number of issues. We can start into something else and take public comment.

D. VanDierendock: I will still attend the Steering Committee and today I arrived to find no acting person of the group and so I was asked to sit at table. So I sit at the table only as representative of planning group, not as a Chair.

Adjourned at 11:48am.